

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

MANDY RICE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 4:19-cv-03166-SEP
)	
ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY, et al.)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff’s motion for an extension of time to complete discovery (ECF #22), which is in response to Defendants’ pending motion for summary judgment (ECF #17). Plaintiff’s motion is **DENIED without prejudice** for failure to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(d).

Rule 56(d) requires a litigant seeking time to conduct additional discovery before filing a response to a motion for summary judgment to “show[] by affidavit or declaration that, for specified reasons, [she] cannot present facts essential to justify [her] opposition [to summary judgment].” FED. R. CIV. P. 56(d). In her motion seeking “the opportunity to obtain discovery from Defendants before responding to Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment,” Plaintiff fails to offer an affidavit or declaration explaining with specified reasons why she cannot adequately respond to Defendants’ summary judgment motion. Instead, Plaintiff recounts various discovery-related rulings in a previous state court action, arguing that she was “largely denied the ability to conduct thorough discovery in the [state] court matter.” Generalized complaints about discovery do not

satisfy Rule 56(d)'s requirements. *See Anzaldua v. Northeast Ambulance and Fire Protection Dist.*, 793 F.3d 822, 837 (8th Cir. 2015) (a motion seeking to defer summary judgment is appropriately denied where it does not “state with specificity what evidence further discovery would uncover” or how that evidence, even if uncovered, is “essential” to the non-movant’s defense).

This Court has broad discretion to award additional time for discovery before summary judgment in response to an adequately-supported Rule 56(d) motion. FED. R. CIV. P. 56(d)(2); *see also GEICO Casualty Co. v. Isaacson*, 932 F.3d 721, 726 (8th Cir. 2019) (the district court has “wide discretion” when considering a Rule 56(d) motion). Plaintiff has until January 2, 2020, to file such a motion or respond to Defendants’ motion for summary judgment.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff Mandy Rice’s motion for an extension of time to complete discovery (ECF #22) is **DENIED without prejudice**.

So ordered this 27th day of December 2019.

/s/ Sarah E. Pitlyk
SARAH E. PITLYK
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE